UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED LLC,) et al.,	Case No. 3:12-cv-03865-VC
Plaintiffs,	ORDER GRANTING STAY
v.)	
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD., et al.,	
Defendants.))

Plaintiffs ask the court to stay all deadlines and proceedings in this case¹ other than the deadline for Plaintiffs to seek relief and file objections to the undersigned's Claim Construction Report and Recommendation.² In light of that report, Plaintiffs offered Defendants in this and the related actions³ a stipulation to a judgment of non-infringement should Judge Chhabria adopt the recommended construction of "an entire oscillator disposed upon said integrated circuit substrate" in U.S. Patent 5,809,336.4

¹ See Docket No. 100.

² See Docket No. 98.

³ See Technology Properties Limited, LLC et al. v. ZTE Corporation et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03876-VC; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. Nintendo Co., Ltd et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03881-VC; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. LG Electroncis, Inc. et al., Case No. 3:12cv-03880-VC; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. Samsung Electronic Co., LTD et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03877-VC.

⁴ See Docket No. 100 at 1.

For the Northern District of California

The other Defendants accepted the offer and agreed to stay;⁵ Defendants here declined.⁶ They say they have a right to pursue their claim that the '336 patent is invalid, and that a stay would unfairly delay their right to a ruling.⁷

With full appreciation of Defendants' interest in finally getting a resolution of a dispute between the parties that began in 2006, on balance a stay is warranted. With the related cases stayed, there is little or no reason to proceed here in a piecemeal fashion. As the court explained before, the primary goal of the referral to the undersigned is give the presiding judge a single package of items for final resolution if necessary. That goal is undermined by anything less than a complete stay.

Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 2, 2015

PAUL S. GREWAL

United States Magistrate Judge

⁵ See Technology Properties Limited, LLC et al. v. ZTE Corporation et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03876-VC at Docket No. 111; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. Nintendo Co., Ltd et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03881-VC at Docket No. 108; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. LG Electroncis, Inc. et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03880-VC at Docket No. 119; Technology Properties Limited LLC et al.v. Samsung Electronic Co., LTD et al., Case No. 3:12-cv-03877-VC at Docket No. 106.

⁶ See Docket No. 100 at 1.

⁷ See Docket No. 103 at 1.